



# City of Carmel

## CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE **MINUTES**

**TUESDAY, AUGUST 1, 2006**

**LOCATION: CAUCUS ROOMS  
CARMEL CITY HALL  
ONE CIVIC SQUARE  
CARMEL, IN 46032**

**TIME: 6:00 P.M.  
DOORS OPEN AT 5:30 P.M.**

Those Present:

**Representing the Committee:**

Dan Dutcher  
Wayne Haney  
Kevin Heber  
Carol Schleif  
Rick Ripma

**Representing the Department:**

Angie Conn  
Karyn Ryg  
Mike Hollibaugh

**Of Counsel:**

John Molitor

Rick Ripma called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00p.m.

**The Subdivision Committee will meet to consider the following items:**

- 1. Docket No. 06010001 Z: Monon Townes PUD – *CONT. TO SEPT. 5<sup>th</sup>***  
The applicant seeks to rezone 6.81 acres from R1/Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of creating 65 townhomes.  
The site is located at 1001 Rohrer Road.  
Filed by Ann M. Walker for Pulte Homes of Indiana, LLC.

2. **Docket No. 06010005 Z: Shelborne Property PUD – *CONT. TO SEPT. 5<sup>th</sup>***  
The applicant seeks to rezone 20 acres from S1/Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of developing single-family residences.  
The site is located on the west side of Shelborne Road, north of 121<sup>st</sup> Street.  
Filed by Charles Frankenberger of Nelson and Frankenberger for Indiana Land Development Co.
3. **Docket No. 06010009 Z: Crook PUD – *CONT. TO SEPT. 5<sup>th</sup>***  
The applicant seeks to rezone 20 acres from S1/Residential to PUD for the purpose of platting 40 single-family homes on 20 acres.  
The site is located at 2238 W. 136<sup>th</sup> Street and is zoned S1/Residential.  
Filed by Charlie Frankenberger of Nelson and Frankenberger for Indiana Land Development.
4. **Docket No. 06020017 CPA:96<sup>th</sup> & Westfield Neighborhood Plan– *CONT. TO SEPT. 5<sup>th</sup>***  
The applicant seeks to amend the Carmel/Clay Comprehensive Plan in order to incorporate the 96<sup>th</sup> & Westfield Neighborhood Plan.  
Filed by the Carmel Department of Community Services.
5. **Docket No. 06040017 PUD: Townhomes at Central Park – *CONT. TO SEPT. 5<sup>th</sup>***  
The applicant seeks to create 110 townhomes on 8.8 acres.  
The site is located at 11400 Westfield Blvd. and is zoned R1 Residential  
Filed by Mary Solada of Bingham McHale for Mann Properties.
6. **Docket No. 06030025 DP Amend/ADLS Amend: Pearson Ford Signage**  
The applicant seeks signage approval for an array of site signage additions and alterations.  
The site is located at 10650 North Michigan Road and is zoned B3/Business. The site is located partially within the US 421/Michigan Road Overlay District.  
Filed by John Pearson of Pearson Realty, LLC, for Pearson Ford.

**Present for the Petitioner:** E. Davis Coots with Coots Henke, and Wheeler representing Pearson Realty.

**Petitioner's Presentation:** Dave Coots said that this was a continuation of the ADLS approval that was heard by the Plan Commission. He said that authority had been granted to the Committee to review and approve the signage. He went through and explained the signage locations as presented on the exhibits in the file. He said that he also wanted to bring up the concept of using the Deco Brick building material. He handed the Committee members a booklet about the Deco Brick product. He said that they were capable of doing a variety of textures and looks with the material. He said that they were asking the Committee to consider the application amendment to substitute Deco-Brick for the brick veneer.

**Carol Schleif** asked what the reason for the change would be. She asked if it was as thin as the

material samples that were presented.

**A representative from Irwin-Rogers Brick and Block** said that it is all the way through the way. He said that this is both a structural and decorative single application. He said that the block is all the way through the wall twelve inches. He said that the dimensions are 4 inches tall by 16 inches wide by 12 inches. He said that the benefits are cost and getting the structural component and the decorative component in one application.

**Department Report: Angie Conn** said that the Department recommends approval of the project since the petitioners submitted the required documents that the Department requested.

**Rick Ripma** said that they would discuss the signage and then move to the building material. He asked if the sign that said "Commercial Trucks" was already up.

**Dave Coots** said that it had been permitted and was already installed.

**John Pearson** clarified that the particular sign that Mr. Ripma was asking about would be amended to read "Truck Center" not "Commercial Trucks".

**Kevin Heber** asked if it was common to have the double sign thing.

**Angie Conn** said that it is kind of necessary since it is sits back further from 106<sup>th</sup> Street and Michigan Rd. She clarified that it is pretty normal when a building sits farther off of a road.

**Kevin Heber** wanted to know what the reason was for the 10 ft. 8 inch sign.

**Dave Coots** explained that it was the marquis sign for the Nottingham Plaza. He said that there might be one or more tenants that might share the marquis sign.

**Carol Schleif** said that it seems like marquis signs are usually a lot larger.

**Angie Conn** said that the ordinance requires eight feet and that the petitioners are proposing 10.5 feet. She said that for the ones that are larger they usually have obtained a variance.

**Rick Ripma** said that he knew that at one point there was a push to have the signage such that they would appear a color during the day, but would illuminate at night as white letters. He asked if that was still an issue for the City. He noted that they asked National City to do that.

**Mike Hollibaugh** responded that the City likes it and that the City doesn't have an ordinance for it, but that some past Commissioners felt pretty strongly about it. He said that we certainly wouldn't discourage it.

**Rick Ripma** said that on the building materials, he thinks that from a distance it looks fine, but that up close he thinks that it looks terrible. He said that he thinks that if they agreed to do brick

then the petitioners ought to do brick.

**Wayne Haney** said that he actually thinks that the storage place looks pretty good.

**Carol Schleif** noted that the building material doesn't have the same variation in color as brick.

**Wayne Haney** asked how you got the variation in the colors.

Discussion ensued regarding the process of installing and preparing the Deco-Brick material.

**Dave Coots** said that he doesn't think that there is any aversion on the part of the petitioner to the blended brick product. He said that it amounted to a considerable financial savings to be able to use this product. He noted that it would save a couple of hundred thousand dollars.

**Rick Ripma** said that another one of his issues is that they haven't had the chance to be able to go out and look at it. He said that if you look at the pieces, he thinks that it is very obvious what it is and he thinks that it won't look very good if you are close to the door.

**Carol Schleif** clarified that the Deco-brick building material would be used on the signs and the building.

**Mike Hollibaugh** clarified that the Deco-Brick would have to have a separate vote and approval from the signage. He said that it would need to have a docket number also.

**Dave Coots** said that as opposed to being denied because it is a product that the Committee is unfamiliar with in terms of appearance, he said that he would ask the Committee to vote on the signage tonight, so the petitioner can move forward with their variances and that they would come back at the next Committee meeting with the Deco-Brick material as an amendment to their ADLS approval.

**Rick Ripma** said that he was much more comfortable with that.

**Carol Schleif** said that she would like new information ahead of the meeting in order to be able to give it thought time.

**Dan Dutcher** made formal motion **to approve docket number 06030025 DP Amend/ADLS Amend: Pearson Ford Signage for the signage portion only.**

**Dave Coots** said that he would submit a revised drawing of the sign with the verbiage change from "Commercial Trucks" to "Truck Center" to the Department for the file.

**Carol Schleif** seconded the motion.

Motion was **APPROVED 5-0.**

...END...

**7. Docket No. 06050020 PP: Clay Creek**

The applicant seeks to plat 30 lots on 29.971 acres.

The site is located on Hoover Road north of 116<sup>th</sup> Street and is zoned S1.

The applicant seeks the following waivers for the proposed plat:

**06050022 SW:** SCO Chapter 6.05.07 Orientation of Home – request to allow dwellings to face internal street

**06050023 SW:** SCO Chapter 7.05.07 Clearing of greater than 15% of mature woodlands.

Filed by Charlie Frankenberger for MHE Development Co. LLC.

**Present for the Petitioner:** Charlie Frankenberger with Nelson and Frankenberger, Gary Merritt with ME Development, Art Kaser with Evergreen Planners, and John Lapp with Kevin K. Parsons & Associates.

**Petitioner's Presentation:** Charlie Frankenberger introduced the project. He said that Meeting House Road was the subject of much discussion at the Plan Commission Public Hearing. He said that it is currently shown on the Northern Boundary of the property. He said that as part of this request, the petitioners are required to construct Meeting House Road. He said that Carmel's thoroughfare plan designates it as a collector street. He said that it would line up with the existing Meeting House Road. He said that it was the petitioners understanding that a landscaped median was required in the center of Meeting House Road as well. He explained the two Subdivision Waivers the petitioners were requesting. He said that the residences would be custom ranging in price from \$750,000 to \$950,000. He said that, of the eight acres of woodlands, they would be preserving 5.5 acres and clearing 2.49 acres, but that ME Development had committed to reforest. He said that some reforestation will occur in the common areas and some will occur in the median of Meeting House Rd. and he said that the rest would occur in areas approved by the Urban forester. He said that the street perspective from Meeting House Rd. and Hoover Road and the more detailed tree preservation plan that were requested at the Plan Commission hearing will be forthcoming. He said that he will have those things in the packets submitted for the September 5, 2006 Plan Commission Subdivision Committee meeting. He said that he wanted to work through the discussion of Meeting House Road.

**Rick Ripma** called for general public comments – unfavorable.

**Doug Boehme**, who resides at 1355 Clay Spring Drive, said that he doesn't oppose \$800,000 homes. He said that he doesn't oppose the extension of Meeting House Road to connect with Ditch because that has been in the long-term plan. He said that what he opposes is Meeting House Road in the location that the developer wants it to be. He said that Mr. Frankenberger said that the road is designated to run through there. He said that the 20-year thoroughfare plan, it just shows that it is going to connect at Meeting House Road and Ditch. He said that there is nothing that says that it can't go South. He said that the road could go down at seventy-five

degrees. He said that they feel strongly against this road because it creates a double frontage. He said that there are 13+ homes that are going to be double fronted plus another 7-8 if the road were to extend. He said that the biggest issue is going to be a hit on the housing values. He said that their homes are the biggest investment that most of them have. He said that they want to hold on to whatever value they can get. He said that making the homes double frontage is going to be devastating to their property values. He read a letter from John Compton, who is a local appraiser, which expressed Mr. Compton's professional concerns of the Clay Creek development in terms of the proposed location of Meeting House Road, the removal of the tree line behind the Clay Springs properties, the creation of traffic, and the devaluation of property values. A copy of this letter and the pictures attached has been incorporated into the file for Docket number 06050020 PP: Clay Creek.

**Dennis Carafiol**, who lives at 1363 Clay Spring Drive, said that his lot is about 200 lineal feet of frontage along the South property line of Clay Springs. He said that they specifically picked the lot to build their first home on. He said that they were thrilled with the idea of living in a small suburban neighbor with a pasture and wildlife beyond their backyard fence. He said that they have lived there for twelve years and haven't ever been naïve enough to think that the field would stay the same private sanctuary that it is today. He said that they always knew that a neighborhood would be built behind them. He said that while the existing plan for the Clay Creek subdivision is unimaginatively designed, that is the least of their concerns. He said that City requirement of the extension of Meeting House Road with essentially no buffer shows a bewildering and appalling lack of consideration to the citizens of Carmel that live in either of these neighborhoods. He said that the extension of Meeting House road East of Hoover Rd. anywhere near the shared property line would have a devastating effect on property values for those who live along the property line. He said that the negative ripple effect on both neighborhoods would be significant. He said that the idea of regular everyday traffic barreling up and down this road just a few feet from their backyards is numbing. He said that he doesn't want it confused with the Monon Trail meandering through their backyards. He said that this is an assault to their privacy and, for many obvious reasons; this is a disaster for us in the effected neighborhoods. He said that he has two small children and his neighbors have three small children, he said that their neighbors have three and some other neighbors have four children. He said that their children would be exposed to excessive noise, fumes, and vehicles and they will be forced to reassess when and how they can play. He said that he and his neighbors choose to live in the area for a variety of reasons and they pay a premium to do so. He said that he assures the Committee that one of the reasons they choose to live there is for the quiet, beauty, and safety that the area offers. He said that on behalf of his neighbors in Clay Springs, High grove, and all others who will be negatively affected by this development, he is asking that the road, as is currently proposed be eliminated from the plan, or at the very least significantly modified.

**Elizabeth Vannoy**, who resides at 1837 Braeburn Drive, said that she sent a letter to everyone on the Plan Commission. She gave the Committee members copies of the ordinance 26.03.08. She said that she wants to ask the City to be accountable to what they have already planned. She quoted the ordinance 26.03.08. She said that if Meeting House Road is a collector, as it is being called, then the plan and definition say nothing about a median. She discussed the differences



between a Collector street and an Arterial. She said that the ordinance calls for a minimum of twenty-feet of buffering if it is a Collector street. She explained how she established this figure based on the ordinance. She said that she doesn't understand how this can go through because it is contradicting what the City of Carmel already laid out in their ordinance. She said that the last ordinance, she would reference, section 26.04.04, talks about the buffering not coming from the right-of-way. She said that she believed that the ordinance was saying that the buffering would be in addition to the right-of-way. She presented photos of the trees that will be affected. She said that the woods cannot be duplicated and she noted that the photos also show a marker of how close the road will be. She said that ten feet is not enough.

**Joseph Matura**, who resides at 1875 Winesap Way, said that what they are urging is that the same restrictions be put on the construction of this as was put on the construction of Hoover, and Meeting House Road as it continues into the Village of West Clay in terms of buffering and aesthetics. He said that the residents are also upset because the petitioner is clearly trying to buffer to the new community, but is not giving the same consideration to the homes that already exist there and he said that he and his neighbors were asking for this to be corrected to have equal buffering.

**Todd Hillman**, who resides at 1883 Winesap Way, said that they came from Houston, Texas, where there is no zoning. He said that this plan would basically give him triple frontages because his lot is a corner lot. He said that he sees every car that goes by on Hoover Road out of his bedroom window. He said that he doesn't want to look out the other bedroom window and see cars going that way as well. He said that he had two four-year-olds. He said that people have asked him what he thinks about the houses in High Grove, he tells them, and they say that they won't buy a house in High Grove. He said that they wanted to raise their children in an environment where they could run in their backyard and not have to worry about it. He said that it was unrealistic to look at the land and think that nothing will ever happen there. He said that he would like to see something go on that property that will be a "win-win" for both parties.

**George Geiger**, who owns a company called Shamrock Builders, said that they built approximately 30 homes in the High Grove and Clay Springs area. He said that he would like the City to consider the impact that they will have on these homeowners. He said that the buffering was so important. He said that if the road goes through as it is proposed it will significantly impact the property value of the existing neighbor's homes.

**Department Report, Angie Conn** said that the thoroughfare plan does show the location of Meeting House Road. She said that the reason that the road shows a median is because it is now in the jurisdiction of the City of Carmel. She said that when the previous sections were built, they were under the County's jurisdiction and that the County did not require trees in the Median. She said that another reason that there are trees in the Median is that the trees help absorb the sound impact of cars driving through and provide a visual aesthetic appeal. She said that on the issue of the double-fronted lots, when High Grove was platted, the Meeting House Road location was in place on the thoroughfare plan, but still the lots were platted along the whole South property line. She said that one way to help with the double frontage lots is to possibly pull down Meeting House Road a few feet, so that no High Grove lot can be accessed

from Meeting House Road. She said that the Department wants the petitioner to give an update on the landscape plan and to talk about the outstanding Carmel Engineering issues. She said that the Department recommends that Black Hawk Court be shifted to the North or the South to avoid lining up with the existing tree line of the parcels to the East. She said that she had handed out a letter to the Committee members from a neighbor, named Dane Love, whose parcel abuts the proposed lot eleven. She said that some of his issues are with the clearing of the woodlands, the Nakoma Lane stub, the size of the retention pond, and the location of the proposed lots eleven and twelve. She said that with all of these outstanding issues the Department does recommend that the item be continued to the next meeting.

**Rick Ripma** noted that he forgot to give the petitioner a rebuttal.

**Charlie Franknberger** said that he thinks that the issues are apparent. He said that there was a comment about the thoroughfare plan and he said that it is his understanding the thoroughfare plan map is not to scale and it wasn't when it was drawn intended to specify with the accuracy of a meets and bounds legal description where the road would go. He said that he thinks it is to be located generally in the area where it is shown on the plan.

**Carol Schleif** said that she had a copy with her and that it was interesting that it was shown on the plan to jog down.

**Charlie Frankenberger** said that he did not think that it was a site-specific location drawn on the map. He said that where they have shown it is where they have been told to show it. He said that it is the most efficient place for it to exist. He said that if their matter is not approved and Meeting House Road is built with public funds, it would likely be on the real estate where it is shown because that is an efficient place to extend Meeting House Road. He said that if they were to try to vary the location then there would be different curves in the road going South and then North again. He said that Meeting House Road was shown on the thoroughfare plan at the time that the other subdivisions were approved. He said that if the other subdivisions were approved today, then they would be required to provide the buffering that the petitioners are being required to provide. He said that at the time that those subdivisions were approved, they were not required to buffer along that Southern boundary line. He said that they do want to move forward with this petition. He said that the petitioners believe that it provides for the extension of Meeting House Road and that it provides for the construction of custom homes of a price point that is greater than what exists around it. He said that this is a small area and that the petitioners are preserving a lot of trees on the site. He said that it is a subdivision that is being taxed with the burden of dedicating Meeting House Road in addition to constructing it. He said that it would be very easy for the development to become economically infeasible. He presented a cross section of the road. He said that the road when it is built would most likely affect the fencerow on the South boundary of the lots in High Grove. He said that construction activity would extend into the canopy. He said that one suggestion was to put a five-foot sidewalk on one side of the street and to put a larger trail on the other side.

**Karyn Ryg** added that Staff thought that the petitioner could do a twelve-foot separated multi-use trail on the North side of the road, which would ultimately connect into an off-street trail that



will connect Ditch Road, Spring Mill Rd., and eventually Illinois St. She said that she had the alternate transportation plan, if someone was interested in looking at it. She said that it would be about the width of the Monon.

**Dan Dutcher** said that he really wanted to explore this idea of the street location. He said that it strikes him that the extension the way it is now is maybe the most administratively convenient. But, he said that it doesn't seem to make sense to him because of the neighbors and the double lots. He asked why the petitioner couldn't come down at an angle through the proposed lot five. He said that if the petitioners could come down that way, it could really mitigate the affect on the homeowners? He said that it reminds him of the 136<sup>th</sup> Street expansion issue. He said that he wanted to hear from the Department on what type of advice the petitioner has received that this is the ideal location for it. He said that it certainly isn't his preference.

**Angie Conn** said that many of the City Departments do prefer this street location because it does adequately meet the thoroughfare plan. She said that if the road were to curve through the subdivision, it would eliminate lots, which would make the project infeasible, where it would not be able to be developed. She said that this location is the best for engineering issues.

Discussion ensued about the amount of traffic on Hoover Road.

**Wayne Haney** said that he doesn't see any reason that it has to be up in the part of the site where it is located on the petitioner's plans. He said that one of the main objectives on the Subdivision Committee is to do no harm to the neighbors. He said that is what they do not want to do. He said that with the relocation of the street, it saves the construction costs of building two streets, it eliminates the double-fronted lots.

**Carol Schleif** said that Hoover is a dead end Street. She said that the rationale for Meeting House Road is that the first section was built while it was under the County jurisdiction. She said that she just doesn't get why the petitioner or the City needs twenty feet on each side and four lanes plus a twelve foot median for a residential area that's a dead end street. She said that it doesn't bother her to have the connection to Meeting House Rd. and she said that she likes the diagonal. She asked why the petitioners should be required to build so many roads. She said that the thoroughfare plan jogged down for some future mitigation at some point. She said that the half-acre pond was a little large. She suggested that the petitioners scale down the pond and make it round. She suggested moving the pond out closer to the road, so it could be an amenity for the entire area, not just this development. She said that the petitioners should consider sizing the pond to what it needs to be and should make it look like a natural pond, rather than a square pond. She reiterated that she couldn't imagine needing four lanes and a median for the population in that area.

**Dan Dutcher** said that he is an advocate for quality roads in Carmel, but that he thinks that the road location in this instance is problematic. He said that no matter where the road goes, they would have to have discussion on the tree lines, so he would save his comments on the trees for a different meeting. He said that it seems that the petitioners could do a lot of good by changing the location of the street without sacrificing a lot. He said that he thinks that it is time to start

getting creative in terms of the development standards for that piece of road.

**Rick Ripma** clarified that if Meeting House Road got moved, it could not have residential driveways on it.

**Wayne Haney** pointed out that a couple of lines up; the ordinance also says that you can't have double-frontage lots either. He said that not having double-frontage lots is much more important than whether you have a driveway off of a collector or not.

Discussion ensued regarding the widths of the proposed streets.

**Carol Schleif** clarified that the landscaping plan shows that the petitioner is short on shrubs.

**Charlie Frankenberger** said that revisions to the landscaping plan would be forthcoming, but that they did not have time to get the plans revised before the packet materials were due.

**Dan Dutcher** pointed out that the road location kind of drives everything else.

**Kevin Heber** asked for clarification on why they couldn't have residential driveway access off of a collector.

**Mike Hollibaugh** said that because there is a median in the street, it creates limited access when the homeowners try to enter and exit their driveways.

**Karyn Ryg** added that the street was never intended to be a residential street with residential driveway cuts. She said that part of the reason for the access management is because the street is actually part of a larger picture of connectivity.

**Dan Dutcher** said that the Plan Commission, Staff, and the Petitioner have to explore some flexibility and some options in terms of the road context. He said that they could probably find a way to get creative. He said that he thinks that what is being proposed, however, is a problem.

**Carol Schleif** said that she thinks that the "squiggle" in the thoroughfare plan is indicative of the need for creativity here. She said that she thinks that it isn't clear that the road is intended to go straight through and that she thinks that they were trying to avoid that when they put the thoroughfare plan together.

**Charlie Frankenberger** said that it is not clear, but if you look at it on the thoroughfare plan, it goes along the Southern property line of High Grove for at least a segment. He said that was something that was intended to be exactly there, just like he doesn't think that the little "squiggle" line was intentionally placed. He said that someone just drew a line connecting the two points.

**Rick Ripma** said that it would be continued to the September 5, 2006 meeting of the Plan

Commission Subdivision Committee Meeting.

...END...

**8. Docket No. 06060006 PP Replat: Little Farm Subdivision Lot P16**

The applicant seeks to divide one parcel into two parcels, to allow for the construction of two, two-family dwellings. A variance has been granted to allow for reduced lot size. The site is located at 10506 Combs Avenue and is zoned R3 within the Home Place Overlay. Filed by Shahpor Shahbahrami.

**Present for the Petitioner:** Shahpor Shahbahrami

**Petitioner's Presentation:** Shahpor Shahbahrami introduced the project and passed around photographs of the property and the surrounding area.

Discussion ensued regarding the photographs that were presented and the petitioner's plan for drainage.

**Rick Ripma** clarified that this was the final time that the Plan Commission members would have to weigh in on the project and that if the project was approved it would be the final approval for the project.

**Angie Conn** added that the next approval would be administrative through the Department in the form of Secondary Plat review.

**Department Report:** **Angie Conn** said that the Department received an email from the Hamilton County Surveyor's office at 4:30p.m. She said that he has recommended denial of the project based upon the drainage area and the proposed swale around the house. She said that the petitioner would have to go back through the Hamilton County Surveyor's Office with a new drainage plan. She said that the applicant must also commit to the construction or funding of a sidewalk along the two lots. She said that the Department recommends that the Committee approve this request with the conditions of approval by the Hamilton County Surveyor's and Hamilton County Highway offices. She noted that the Plan Commission waived the rules and procedures at the last meeting to allow the Committee to have the final vote on the project.

**Carol Schleif** said that her concerns are with drainage. She said that if you look at the area, she thinks that a twelve-inch pipe is okay. She said that no one has built anything there because of drainage she suspects. She said that it is a concern to her. She said that historically the lot has already been split once. She said that splitting it again would set a precedent that is changing a neighborhood. She said that Duplexes are there, but that they are typically on a single lot, not a lot that has been split again. She said that if you look at the building coverage relating to the size of the lots, it seems like the petitioner is trying to do too much on a lot that maybe shouldn't even be built on. She said that she suspects that the neighbors upstream have fenced in the lots and ignore that property most of the time because it is under water or damp most of the time.

She said that there is a natural swale right in that area which goes right through the petitioner's lot.

**Shahpor Shahbahrami** said that he is building elevations that have been approved before and that he hired a Professional Surveyor who said that the drainage area is five acres.

Discussion ensued regarding the recent 100-year floods.

**Carol Schleif** said that she would not encourage anyone to build on that site.

**Rick Ripma** clarified that the petitioner had already obtained a variance to split the lots.

**Angie Conn** said that John Molitor just informed her that the Committee couldn't technically deny the petition because he already has the variance to allow the smaller lots. She said that they could add the condition of approval of the drainage plan.

**Angie Conn** clarified that the Hamilton County Surveyor's office recommended denial of the project due to a swale around the house.

**Wayne Haney** clarified the petitioner's drainage plan.

Discussion ensued regarding the Committee's authority with regards to this petition and the role of the variance.

**Angie Conn** said that she had calculated the petitioner's lot coverage and that the petitioner was over by about 10 % as proposed with the building area. She said that Mr. Shahbahrami would have to build a smaller structure or go back before the Board of Zoning Appeals for a variance for lot coverage.

**Shahpor Shahbahrami** said that he was going to reduce the size of his building.

**Rick Ripma** clarified that the boxes shown on the plat were actually the building setbacks, but not the actual building footprint.

**Wayne Haney** said that he would be concerned about the building elevation.

**Shahpor Shahbahrami** said that his building elevation was going to be at 102 and that grade was going to be at 101. He said that this calculation was done by a professional engineer.

**Dan Dutcher** made formal motion to **approve Docket No. 06060006 PP Replat: Little Farm Subdivision Lot P16 with the following conditions: The commitment to reduce lot coverage, approval of the drainage plan by the Hamilton County Surveyor's Office, and the commitment by the applicant to construct or to fund future construction of the sidewalk along Combs Avenue.**

**Kevin Heber** seconded the motion.

Motion was **approved 5-0**.

...END...

**9. Docket No. 06070031 ADLS Amend: World Wide Motors**

The applicant seeks to paint the building exterior and roof, add building lighting, and alter some building base landscaping.

The site is located at 4000 E. 96<sup>th</sup> Street and zoned B-3/Business.

Filed by Tanya Lakes of MCG, LLC.

**Present for the Petitioner:** Marcell Tworek, owner of Miranda Construction.

**Petitioner's Presentation:** Marcell Tworek said that World Wide Motors bought the building to the East of the main dealership. He said that they have been waiting for tenants to clear out. He said that the two-story portion of the building is now vacant and the petitioner's wanted to do a simple renovation to the outside. He said that they want to paint the outside of the building and change the windows. He said that the single story part of the building is still leased. He said that when all of those leases are up, the petitioners would do a major renovation of the building. He said that the petitioners want to make the building a pre-owned sales facility when all of the leases are up. He said that on the site, they would add a little landscaping, add a connecting drive, and seal coating the lot this time. He said that the lot would be repaved and restriped again when the complete renovation is done. He said that the lighting would come off of the building and would be for security.

**Department Report:** Angie Conn said that the Department recommends that the Committee approve this request when all comments and concerns are addressed.

**Wayne Haney** clarified the colors of the exterior paint.

**Carol Schleif** asked the petitioners to put in more mature landscaping in the front.

Discussion ensued regarding the parking islands.

**Dan Dutcher** made formal motion to **approve Docket No. 06070031 ADLS Amend: World Wide Motors**.

**Carol Schleif** seconded the motion.

Motion was **approved 5-0**.

...END...

August 1, 2006  
Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

---

Subdivision Committee Chair – Rick Ripma

---

Respectfully Submitted By: Laura Rouse-DeVore